	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/658,957	TSENG, ANTHONY
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Douglas J. Theisen	1724
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Douglas J. Theisen</u> .	(3)	·
(2) Maria Erlinda C. Sarno.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 13 September 2005	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  ☐ Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)	. ·
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed: none		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.	•	
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary</li> </ul>	examiner will provide a writte ecord of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
		·
·		
Douglas). Theren		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)		

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The text added to paragraphs 36 and 45 of the specification in the preliminary amendment dated 10 September 2003 is considered to be new matter and needs to be deleted in order to allow the claims in the application. A new abstract is needed, because the abstract in the amendment dated 16 April 2005 is too long. The attorney will provide a FAX of the discussed changes, which will be included in an Examiner's amendment.